REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 23- 52 are pending in this application with claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45 and 50 – 52 being amended by this response. Claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45 are formally amended for purposes of clarity and to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed features. Claims 50 – 52 are amended to include the features of claims 47 – 49, respectively, in order to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 101. As claims 50-52 are amended to include features of previously presented claims 47-49, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

Rejection of Claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 44 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 38, 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph because the limitation "specification module" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 38, 41 and 44 have been formally amended to replace the phase "module" with the phrase "unit" thus providing proper antecedent basis for the claimed feature.

Claims 39, 42 and 45 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph because the limitation "recognition module" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 39, 42 and 45 have been formally amended to replace the phase "module" with the phrase "unit" thus providing proper antecedent basis for the claimed feature.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that all instances of improper antecedent basis in claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 44 and 45 have been removed. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 38, 39, 41, 42, 44 and 45 is respectfully requested.

Double Patent Rejection

Claims 23, 34, 47 – 49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 26, 35, 37, 46 – 48 of co-pending Application No, 10/519,633. A Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 has been filed in co-pending Application No. 10/519,633.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the terminal disclaimer being filed, that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 52 – 54 under 35 USC 101

Claims 50 – 52 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter. In particular, claims 50 – 52 are not limited to tangible embodiments. Claims 52 – 54 have been amended to recited "A computer readable medium encoded with a computer program" which comprises the steps claimed therein. As claims 50 – 52 refer to the methods claimed in claims 47 – 49, respectively, claims 50 – 52 have been amended to affirmatively recite steps similar to those found in claims 47 – 49. Furthermore, as the specification provides support for a tangible embodiment, i.e. computer readable medium, on page 20, lines 3 – 9, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments claimed in amended claims 50 – 52 are limited to a tangible embodiment. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 50 – 52 are directed toward statutory subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 23-32 and 34 - 52 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 23-32 and 34 - 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Solvason (WO 02/21840 A2).

Claim 23 provides a recognition unit for recognizing synchronization signals in at least one audiovisual programme received, the audiovisual programme comprising an audiovisual content intended to be transmitted to users and control information. The recognition unit includes a reception module and a recording module for recording in a storage space, recognition elements making it possible to obtain at least one extracted portion of the content of said audiovisual programme. A reception module receives via a broadcasting network, at least one transmitted stream carrying the audiovisual programme. A detection module detects the synchronization signals in the audiovisual programme received, by means of the recognition elements stored in the storage space, by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme received, of the extracted

portion. A transmission module transmits action instructions in case of detection of the synchronization signals in the audiovisual programme, the instructions being designed to trigger at least one action. The module for receiving the recognition elements is designed to receive among the recognition elements, instructions for extracting the extracted portion from at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the stream reception module, the portion being extracted from the audiovisual programme previously received, and in that the recording module is designed to directly extract the portion of said stream according to the extraction instructions and to record the portion in the storage space. For the reasons presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Solvason fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 23 and therefore does not anticipate the recognition unit of claim 23.

Unlike the claimed arrangement, Solvason provides a method of synchronizing a client with a media signal that includes receiving one or more actions corresponding to the media signal, determining an application for handling the actions, and causing the determined application to handle the action (see Abstract). Thus, Solvason merely describes transmitting actions related to broadcasted content to a user or from a server to clients (Solvason, page 13). In Solvason, a control computer provides a user interface that enables **an operator to define an action** and to associate an action with a particular time code (Solvason, page 9), for example time-codes that identify a particular video frame. Actions have the form of "Get smart: 000100: www.getsmart.com/episode12" that causes a client's computer's web-browser to visit the cited web site at the one-hundredth frame of Episode 12 of "Get Smart". The operator may alternatively also enter a time offset for the action, for example one minute after broadcast begins.

The Office Action, on page 6, asserts that Solvason in element 106 of Figure 1 and on page 10, lines 4 – 6, discloses the claimed "recognition unit for recognizing synchronization signals in at least one audiovisual programme received, said audiovisual programme comprising an audiovisual content intended to be broadcast to users and control information, said recognition unit comprising: a reception module

and a recording module for receiving and recording in a storage space, recognition elements making it possible to obtain at least one extracted portion of the content of said audiovisual programme". Applicants respectfully disagree. Solvason's action definitions are not equivalent to the claimed "recognition elements". In the claimed arrangement, the recognition elements are used to detect synchronization signals in the received audio visual programme, by recognition in the content of the audio visual programme of the extracted portion. Thus, Solvason fails to disclose or suggest "a detection module for <u>detecting said synchronization signals in said audiovisual programme received, by means of said recognition elements</u> stored in said storage space, <u>by recognition in the content of said audiovisual programme received, of said extracted portion</u>" as claimed in claim 23. Moreover, the claimed arrangement provides for "recognition elements" which are used to detect synchronization signals in a received audiovisual programme and "action instructions" that are transmitted in case of detection of the synchronization signals. Thus, one skilled in the art would recognize that these are two features are independent and have clear and distinct definitions. Recognition elements are extracted portions of a received audio visual programme that are stored in a storage space and that are used to detect synchronization signals in a received audiovisual programme by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme of the extracted portions. Action instructions are designed to trigger at least one action and are transmitted in case of detection of the synchronization signals.

Unlike the claimed "recognition elements" which are extracted portions of a received audio-visual programme, Solvason's action definitions are actions specifically defined by an operator. Specifically, on page 7, lines 18-19 Solvason provides that *"an operator can use the control computer 110 to define 205 actions"* and on page 8, lines 15-16 Solvason provides *"the control computer can enable an operator to define actions)"* and even further on page 9, lines 17-18 which states that *"... an operator can define actions"*. Thus, the action definitions in Solvason are not equivalent to the claimed "recognition elements" which are extracted portions of a received audio visual programme that are stored in a storage space and that are used to detect synchronization signals in a received audiovisual programme by recognition in the content of the

audiovisual programme of the extracted portions. Unlike the claimed arrangement, Solvason requires additional data be inserted by an operator prior to broadcast in order for any content to be read. Thus, Solvason is not equivalent to the claimed arrangement.

The Office Action, on page 6, further asserts that elements 106 of Figure 1 and page 10, lines 9- 11 of Solvason discloses "a detection module for detecting said synchronization signals in said audiovisual programme received, by means of said recognition elements stored in said storage space, by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme received, of said extracted portion" as claimed in the present arrangement. Applicants respectfully disagree. There is nothing in the cited section (or elsewhere) of Solvason that discloses or suggests the presence of a detection module that detects synchronization signals in a received audiovisual programme by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme received, of extracted portions, as is claimed in claim 23. Rather, element 106 of Figure 1 in Solvason is merely a computer able to implement an action that has been previously defined by an operator. For example, Solvason provides that element 106 may include a computer with a web browser (page 5, line 6) that can automatically navigate to a URL (page 5, lines 9-10) or include an application for downloading and installing protection software (page 5, lines 20-23) or an application for presenting to a user of an option to charge an item on TV to a credit card (p.6, lines 4-6). At page 7, line 1, it is mentioned that client 106 can monitor a broadcast signal to monitor for actions. At page 12, it is mentioned that client 106 view a broadcasted TV or radio program, and at lines 19-20, that a client processes an action at a designated time. At page 13, it is mentioned that a client 106 can send data to server 110 (lines 5-6). Further on at page 13, Solvason provides that a client 106 includes an operating system and one or more applications and instructions for processing actions that can invoke other applications and make operating system calls, and on page 13, line 16 – page 14, line 8, provides what instructions can be implemented by a client. For example, the instructions include registering with a server, determining an application for an action, parsing information included in the action to identify whether an action includes an URI, or looking for keywords that indicate which operation a client should perform. Solvason also provides that the client 106 may

specify that an action is to be queued or executed upon receipt or arrival at a specified time, and that the client 106 may request that the client prompts a user before executing an action (page 14, lines 14-18). At page 10, lines 1-11, Solvason describes that a control computer may embed actions in a media signal, and that server 112 can monitor the signal and extract action definitions that it transmits to clients 106. However, unlike the claimed arrangement, any of the actions described above which are initiated by the client is performed in response to data that was previously embedded by an operator to be such an indicator. This is NOT equivalent to the claimed arrangement which uses "a detection module for detecting said synchronization signals in said audiovisual programme received, by means of said recognition elements stored in said storage space, by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme received, of said extracted portion". Solvason requires a data item be inserted in data stream (see page 9, lines 1 – 10 which state that an operator watches the stream real-time to prepare for appropriate client actions). This is fundamentally different from the claimed arrangement which does not require any information be associated with the audiovisual programme because the claimed arrangement detects "synchronization signals in said audiovisual programme received, by means of said recognition elements stored in said storage space, by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme received, of said extracted portion".

Thus, element 106 or page 10, lines 1-11 or elsewhere Solvason fails to disclose or suggests the presence of a detection module that detects synchronization signals in a received audiovisual programme by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme received, of extracted portions, as is claimed in claim 26. Solvason merely monitors a media signal to extract action definitions which are manually input by an operator. Solvason also fails to disclose or suggest detecting synchronization signals in a received audiovisual programme by recognition in the content of the audiovisual programme received, of extracted portions of the programme.

The Office Action further asserts that Solvason, on page 10, lines 10 – 24, discloses that the "module for receiving the recognition elements is designed to receive among said recognition elements, instructions for extracting said extracted portion from at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the

stream reception module, said portion being extracted from said audiovisual programme previously received, and in that said recording module is designed to directly extract said portion of said stream according to said extraction instructions and to record the said portion in the storage space" as claimed in claim 23. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passage of Solvason merely discusses a user interface that allows an operator to define actions for a particular broadcast. The action can include a URI, an application program command and parameters, and/or other instructions or data for transmission to clients 106. The action can also include synchronization information such as a date, time, or frame of an action. The interface allows the operator to specify certain characteristics of the action, such as automatic perform or prompt user before execution or criteria that must be satisfied for performance of the action. In no way, the cited passage discloses or suggests a module for receiving recognition elements that receives among these recognition elements instructions for extracting the extracted portion from audiovisual stream(s), and that a recording module is designed to directly extract the portion from the stream according to the extraction instructions and to record the portion in the storage space. Thus, as each element claimed in claim 23 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Solvason, Solvason fails to anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Claims 24 – 32 are dependent on claim 23 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 23. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Solvason fails to anticipate claims 24 – 32.

Claim 34 provides a specification unit for specifying synchronization signals associated with at least one audiovisual programme, the audiovisual programme comprising an audiovisual content intended to be transmitted to users and control information, and the synchronization signals being intended to be detected in at least one stream carrying the audiovisual programme transmitted via a broadcasting network and to thus trigger at least one action. The said specification unit includes a preparation module for preparing recognition elements making it possible to obtain at least one extracted portion of the content of the audiovisual programme and a transmission

module for transmitting the recognition elements independently of transmissions of the audiovisual programme, to at least one recognition unit intended to detect the synchronization signals in the transmitted stream carrying the audiovisual programme, by recognizing the extracted portion in the content of the audiovisual programme. the preparation and transmission modules of the unit are designed respectively to prepare and transmit extraction instructions, in at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the recognition unit via the broadcasting network, for extracting the portion of content, the portion being extracted from the audiovisual programme previously received. For the reasons presented below Applicants respectfully submit that Solvason fails to disclose or suggest each feature of claim 34 and therefore does not anticipate claim 37.

The Office Action on page 9 asserts that page 6, lines 10-13 of Solvason discloses the claimed "preparation module for preparing **recognition elements** making it possible to obtain at least one extracted portion of the content of said audiovisual programme". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited passage of Solvason merely discusses that a system 100 for synchronizing actions performed by a computer 106 with a TV 104 or radio show can be implemented in various ways. For example, Solvason provides that system 100 includes a control computer 110 that enables an operator to define actions corresponding to a media signal. The action elements in Solvason are NOT equivalent to the claimed recognition elements. Specifically, Solvason's actions correspond to an URI or a command (page 2, line 5-6). This is fundamentally different from the claimed recognition elements which are transmitted to at least one recognition unit intended and used in detecting synchronization signals associated with at least one audiovisual programme in a transmitted stream carrying the audiovisual programme, by recognizing extracted portion(s) in the content of the audiovisual programme. The URI command described in Solvason is NOT equivalent to the claimed recognition elements. URI commands are not used for detecting synchronization of any type for any purpose and therefore are not "recognition elements" which make it possible to obtain at least one extracted portion of the content of an audiovisual programme as claimed in claim 37.

The Office Action on page 9 further asserts that page 6, lines 14-17 of Solvason provides enabling disclosure of "a transmission module for transmitting said recognition elements independently of transmissions of said audiovisual programme, to at least one recognition unit intended to detect said synchronization signals in said transmitted stream carrying said audiovisual programme, by recognizing said extracted portion in the content of said audiovisual programme" as recited in claim 34. Applicants respectfully disagree. Solvason fails to disclose or suggest the transmission of recognition elements. Rather, Solvason, on page 6 lines 14-17, merely describes the transmission of actions that correspond to an URI or command (page 2, lines 5-6). As discussed above, one skilled in the art would not equate the URI actions of Solvason with the transmitted recognition elements of the claimed apparatus.

The Examiner further asserts that Solvason , on page 10, lines 12 – 14, discloses that "the preparation and transmission modules of said unit are designed respectively to prepare and transmit extraction instructions, in at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the recognition unit via the broadcasting network, for extracting said portion of content, said portion being extracted from said audiovisual programme previously received" as recited in claim 34. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passage of Solvason merely discusses a user interface that allows an operator to define actions for a particular broadcast. The action can include a URI, an application program command and parameters, and/or other instructions or data for transmission to clients 106. The action can also include synchronization information such as a date, time, or frame of an action. The interface allows the operator to specify certain characteristics of the action, such as automatic perform or prompt user before execution or criteria that must be satisfied for performance of the action. In no way, the cited passage discloses or suggests the feature of claim 34 of "wherein the preparation and transmission modules of said unit are designed respectively to prepare and transmit extraction instructions, in at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the recognition unit via the broadcasting network, for extracting said portion of content, said portion being

extracted from said audiovisual programme previously received" as claimed in the present claimed arrangement. Therefore, as Solvason fails to teach each of the features of claim 34 and claim 34 is not anticipated by Solvason.

Claims 35-36 are dependent on claim 34 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 35 and 36 are also not anticipated by Solvason.

Claim 37 provides synchronization system comprising a specification unit for specifying synchronization signals associated with at least one audiovisual programme, the audiovisual programme comprising an audiovisual content intended to be transmitted to users and control information. A recognition unit for recognizing the synchronization signals in at least one stream carrying the audiovisual programme transmitted via a broadcasting network, by recognizing at least one extracted portion of the content of the audiovisual programme, in the audiovisual programme received. An activation unit is designed to trigger at least one action in the case of detection of the synchronization signals by the recognition unit. The specification unit is designed to prepare and transmit to the recognition unit recognition elements making it possible to obtain the extracted portion and comprising instructions for extracting the portion of the content from at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the recognition unit via the broadcasting network, the portion being extracted from the audiovisual programme previously received, and in that the recognition unit is designed to directly extract the portion of the stream according to the extraction instructions and to record the portion. For the reasons presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Solvason fails to disclose each feature of claim 37 and therefore does not anticipate claim 37.

The Office Action, on page 10, asserts that page 6, lines 10 – 13 of Solvason discloses the claimed "synchronization system comprising: a specification unit for specifying synchronization signals associated with at least one audiovisual programme, said audiovisual programme comprising an audiovisual content intended to be broadcast to users and control information". Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited

passage of Solvason merely discusses that a system 100 for synchronizing actions performed by a computer 106 with a TV 104 or radio show can be implemented in various ways; for example, the system 100 includes a control computer 110 that enables an operator to define actions corresponding to a media signal. The operator controlled control computer in Solvason is not equivalent to "a specification unit for specifying synchronization **signals** associated with at least one audiovisual programme, said audiovisual programme comprising an audiovisual content intended to be broadcast to users and control information" as claimed by claim 37. Unlike the claimed arrangement which specifies synchronization signals, the cited passage of Solvason is about specifying actions. Synchronization signals as in the claimed arrangement are NOT actions manually specified by an operator in Solvason. Synchronization signals, as claimed by claim 37, are used to trigger actions in case of detection of the signals. No equivalent feature is disclosed or suggested by Solvason.

The Office Action further asserts that, page 10, lines 1 – 11 of Solvason discloses "a recognition unit for recognizing said synchronization signals in at least one stream carrying said audiovisual programme transmitted via a broadcast network, by recognizing at least one extracted portion of the content of said audiovisual programme, in the audiovisual programme received" as recited in claim 37. Applicants respectfully disagree. Rather, the section relied on in the Office Action, Solvason describes a control computer that may embed actions in a media signal, and that server 112 can monitor the signal and extract action definitions that it transmits to clients 106. Alternatively, a server is not needed and client computers 106 monitor themselves media signals and process embedded actions. This is fundamentally different from the claimed arrangement which provides a synchronization system with a recognition unit for recognizing synchronization signals in a transmitted stream carrying an audiovisual programme transmitted via a broadcasting network. The only extraction performed in Solvason is extracting action definitions from a media signal. Extracting action is NOT equivalent to recognition of synchronization signals in a transmitted stream of an audiovisual programme.

The Office Action further asserts that page 9, lines 11 – 24 of Solvason discloses "an activation unit designed to trigger at least one action in case of detection of said synchronization signals by the recognition unit" as recited in claim 37. Applicants respectfully disagree. At page 9, lines 11-24, Solvason merely mentions that a control computer that provides a user interface that allows an operator to define actions and associate these actions with a time-code, for example time-codes identifying a particular video-frame; or associate an action with a time-offset, e.g. one minute after broadcast starts. A user interface allowing an operator to define actions and associate these actions with a time-code or a time-offset as described in Solvason is NOT equivalent to an activation unit designed to trigger at least one action in case of detection of a synchronization signal by a recognition unit" as claimed by claim 37. This feature is not contemplated by Solvason.

The Office Action further asserts that Solvason, on page 10, lines 12-24, discloses that "the specification unit is designed to prepare and transmit to the recognition unit recognition elements making it possible to obtain said extracted portion and comprising instructions for extracting said portion of the content from at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the recognition unit via the broadcasting network, said portion being extracted from said audiovisual programme previously received, and in that the recognition unit is designed to directly extract said portion of said stream according to said extraction instructions and to record said portion" as claimed in claim 37. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited passage of Solvason merely discusses a user interface that allows an operator to define actions for a particular broadcast. The action can include a URI, an application program command and parameters, and/or other instructions or data for transmission to clients 106. The action can also include synchronization information such as a date, time, or frame of an action. The interface allows the operator to specify certain characteristics of the action, such as being automatically performed or to prompt a user before execution or define criteria that must be satisfied for performance of the action. However, the cited passage (or elsewhere) fails to disclose or suggest that "the specification unit is designed to prepare and transmit to the recognition unit recognition elements making it possible to obtain said extracted portion and comprising instructions

for extracting said portion of the content from at least one stream of an audiovisual programme previously received by the recognition unit via the broadcasting network, said portion being extracted from said audiovisual programme previously received, and in that the recognition unit is designed to directly extract said portion of said stream according to said extraction instructions and to record said portion" as recited in claim 37. Defining aspects of an action to be performed is NOT equivalent to preparing and transmitting "recognition elements making it possible to obtain said extracted portion" of the stream. As discussed above, the action instructions in Solvason are NOT equivalent to the claimed "recognition elements" as they operate in entirely different manner and accomplish a different goal than the claimed "recognition elements". Therefore, as Solvason fails to disclose or suggest each feature of claim 37, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 37 is not anticipated by Solvason.

Claim 38 is dependent on claim 34 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 34.

Claim 39 is dependent on claim 23 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 23.

Claim 40 is dependent on claim 37 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 37.

Claim 41 is dependent on claim 34 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 34.

Claim 42 is dependent on claim 23 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 23.

Claim 43 is dependent on claim 37 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 37.

Claim 44 is dependent on claim 34 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 34.

Claim 45 is dependent on claim 23 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 23.

Claim 46 is dependent on claim 37 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 37.

Independent claim 47 includes similar features as claim 23 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 23. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Solvason fails to anticipate claim 47.

Independent claim 48 includes similar features as claim 34 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 34. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Solvason fails to anticipate claim 48.

Independent claim 49 includes similar features as claim 37 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 37. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Solvason fails to anticipate claim 49.

Independent claim 50 includes similar features as claims 23 and 47 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 23 and 47. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Solvason fails to anticipate claim 50.

Independent claim 51 includes similar features as claims 34 and 48 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 34 and 48. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Solvason fails to anticipate claim 51.

Independent claim 52 includes similar features as claims 37 and 49 and therefore is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 37 and 49. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Solvason fails to anticipate claim 52.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that Solvason fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claims 23 – 32 and 34 – 52. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23 – 32 and 34 – 52 are not anticipated by Solvason. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solvason (WO 02/21840 A2) in view of Blackketter et al. (US 2002/0056129 A1)

Claim 33 is dependent on claim 23 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 23. Blackketter alone or in combination with Solvason fails to disclose or suggest "a reception module and a recording module, for receiving and recording in a storage space, recognition elements making it possible to obtain at least one extracted portion of the content of said audiovisual programme" as recited in claim 23. Blackketter (with Solvason) also fails to disclose or suggest "a detection module for detecting said synchronization signals in said audiovisual programme received, by means of said recognition elements stored in said storage space, by recognition in the content of said audiovisual programme received, of said extracted portion" and "a transmission module for transmitting action instructions in case of detection of said synchronization signals in said audiovisual programme, said instructions being designed so as to trigger at least one action" as recited in claim 23.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Blackketter when taken alone or in combination with Solvason fails to make the present invention as claimed in claim 26 unpatentable. As claim 33 is dependent on claim 23, Applicants further respectfully submit that claim 33

is patentable over Solvason in view of Blackketter. It is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits, in view of the above arguments, that the all arguments made by the Examiner have been addressed and this rejection should be withdrawn. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is patentable.

The fee of four hundred and ninety dollars ($490.00) for the two month extension of time is being paid upon filing of this amendment. No additional fee is believed due. However, if any additional fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By:_____

Jack Schwartz

Reg. No. 34,721

Tel. No. (212) 971-0416

Thomson Licensing Inc.

Patent Operations

PO Box 5312

Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

August 28, 2009